

R E M A R K S

Claims 1, 2, and 11 are currently pending in the application. New claims 12-16 are presented for consideration. Claims 1, 2, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,682,671, to Hengstenberger et al. (Hengstenberger), in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,519,269, to Howlett et al. (Howlett).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 11 and favorable consideration of new claims 12-16 are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiner Chin-Shue for the courtesies extended him at the interview on July 27, 2009.

During the interview, the undersigned discussed bringing in specifics as to how the single, continuous length of strapping is fixed to itself to define the separate arm loops and a drag grip.

Hengstenberger does not teach or make obvious the use of a single continuous length of strapping to define separate arm loops and a drag grip. Whereas forming two loops from a single strapping length as in Hengstenberger can be relatively simply accomplished, it is much more complicated to make the drag harness in a practical form as claimed from a single continuous length of strapping.

Howlett does not disclose separate arm loops and a drag grip and is relied upon by the Examiner for the disclosure of separate loops, one associated with each of the user's arms. Aside from the fact that Howlett lacks a drag grip, the restraining rope 8 is connected to the strap material using a "D-ring" 38. Thus, Howlett gives no guidance as to how one might form separate loops and a drag grip from a single continuous length of strapping.

As amended, claim 1 recites a specific manner of strategically overlapping portions of the continuous length of strapping so as to define a drag harness that is potentially strong, evenly distributes forces, and does not cause a localized force application to the person wearing the drag harness during use. The last objective is made possible by limiting the number of stacked, lapped lengths at locations where the drag harness contacts an individual wearing the same.

All of the details in the amended claims, and those newly presented, are clearly set forth in the initial disclosure. This disclosure has been expanded to describe some of the details shown in the originally filed drawings and does not introduce any new matter.

It is respectfully submitted that the novel fixing of the lapped lengths as now claimed patentably distinguishes the applicants' drag harness from the prior art.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 11 and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER

By



John S. Mortimer
Reg. No. 30,407

Dated: Aug. 3, 2009

500 West Madison Street
Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661-2562
(312) 876-2113